the executive and judicial functions would be completely separated. The post of Income-tax Inspectors might also be abolishsd, since the Tahsildars had been relieved of their Devaswom and Magisterial functions and since the profession tax assessment lists prepared by the Municipal Councils could be made use of by the Income-tax Department.

In regard to the Excise Department, he suggested the abolition of the Nagercoil and Alleppey Circles. Referring to the Education Department, he observed that there was no necessity to have Personal Assistants to the Director of Public Instruction and to the Inspectors of English and Vernacular Schools and that the staff in His Highness the Maha Raja's College was capable of considerable reduction. The Assistant Superintendents of the Police Department who were merely Personal Assistants to the District Superintendents of Police could be abolished, and, in the Department of Public Works, four Executive Engineers would be quite sufficient for the State. A substantial reduction might be effected in the number of the Assistant Engineers and Sub-Engineers also, while the Workshops and Stores Division might be amalgamated and placed under the charge of an Assistant Engineer. He considered that a Sanitary Commissioner was superfluous, as his work could be managed by the Darbar Physician. Turning to the Devaswom Department, the Member said that substantial reduction might be effected by appointing non-official committees to manage the Devaswoms.

Dewan's reply.—I thank you very much for your suggestions. Most of them are similar to those made by the Salaries Committee. As I have already said, there is no finality in these matters. A suggestion, the carrying out of which may not be practicable now, may be found feasible at a later time. So far as the Secretariat is concerned, I wish you would come and work there for a short time. If you do so, I am sure that you will not subscribe to the view that the number of Secretaries could be further reduced.

II. MAIN HEADS OF REVENUE.

(1) Land Revenue and Income-tax.

8. Land records maintenance in the State.

Mr. N. G. Parameswaran Pillai (Member, Mavelikara Taluk) said that, for a proper and satisfactory system of land revenue administration, a current land register and a land map were highly necessary, that changes due to frequent transfers of property should be noted both in the register and in the map, and that, for that reason, an accurate survey and settlement should precede every attempt at a successful land records maintenance. The survey already completed was defective in several respects. The Member was of opinion that the failure of the land records maintenance work in Travancore was due to three causes, *viz.*, (1) the unwieldy area of some of the *pakuthies* which should not generally exceed three or four square miles so as to be manageable by a simple village officer; (2) the dual responsibility for work thrown upon the Survey and Revenue Departments; and (3) the ignorance of survey work on the part of revenue officers. He stated that the present system of land records maintenance was a more elaborate repetition of the former system, and therefore subject, in a greater degree, to all the faults of the old system. What are known as *poramboke* subdivisions existed at the time of settlement only on paper, and even on paper they were created without reference to the actual state of affairs. The Member said that the Assistant Tahsildars were not attending to *pokkuvaravu* subdivision work. The sketches known as divide sketches were not drawn to scale and had not been demarcated on the ground. Trees covered by *pattas* were treated as trees on *porambokes* and they were then taken over by the Government after the real owner was convicted and fined. The Member then suggested that the concessions granted to cultivation in respect of the *porambokes* on the banks of the Neyyar, Killiyar, Chittar and Karamanai rivers should be extended to all *porambokes*, since the origin of all such *porambokes* was the same. Seeing that the *porambokes* were not usually taxed lands, the Government might notify to the ryots to vacate occupations, and in case they refused to do so within a prescribed time, the Land Conservancy Regulation might be put into operation. The Member also made the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

following suggestions, *viz.*, (*a*) that there should be some restrictions on the power of the Tahsildars to impose fines on alleged trespassers, the amount of the fine being limited to the amount of the assessment on the occupied area from the date of settlement up to the present time ; (*b*) that the Tahsildar disposing of *poramboke* cases might be directed to inspect the encroachments before proceedings were started against the alleged trespassers, at least when required by the parties to do so, and that, in case the Tahsildars could not find time for the purpose, the Assistant Tahsildars might be empowered to dispose of such cases after the necessary local inspection; (*c*) that the Tahsildars who were now divested of all work in connection with the Devaswom and Magisterial Departments might be asked to attend to the land records maintenance work which was their legitimate duty, the post of Assistant Tahsildars being abolished; (*d*) that, if it was considered desirable to continue the Assistant Tahsildars, the Land Records Maintenance Department might be completely separated from the Revenue Department and that, until the records were brought up to date, it might be declared that the Tahsildar should have nothing to do with that work; (*e*) that the powers of the Land Records Superintendent might be decentralised and the staff for each taluk placed under the complete disciplinary control of the Assistant Tahsildar, the latter corresponding direct with the Superintendent, who should have appellate powers alone; (*f*) that before the question of resurvey of the taluks of Trivandrum and Chirayinkil was finally decided, one of the two taluks might be subjected to a regular resurvey and the other to the present system of land records maintenance and the proposed supplemental survey, and the results of the two operations compared, it being the Member's opinion that the former course would be more economical than the latter and (*g*) that, with a view to remove the evils of the last survey and settlement, a resurvey should be conducted very carefully by an officer not below the rank of an Assistant Tahsildar with the necessary staff, who should conduct a field-to-field inspection and prepare eye-sketches of all fields with the necessary *porambokes*, those eye-sketches being subsequently used by the surveyors for the actual survey.

Dewan's reply.—I must join issue with you in regard to some of your remarks. You say that the existing survey is bad. That is what the Government itself says. But you go on to say that the measures now adopted for land records maintenance have all the faults of the earlier system. I can claim some knowledge of survey and I must request you to read the rules which have been issued with a view to see whether the measures now adopted are really as faulty as they are thought to be. In the first place, there is no overlapping of work under the existing rules between the Assistant Tahsildar and the Tahsildar. We do not want to sever the connection between the Tahsildar and the Assistant Tahsildar entirely, because the work done by the Assistant Tahsildar has to be taken up and followed by the Tahsildar. The Assistant Tahsildar has first to see with the agency at his disposal whether any encroachments have been made and, if so, to measure the encroachments, prepare sketches, and express his views as to whether they are recent encroachments or old occupations. It is for him, as a reasonable officer, to inspect and say whether these encroachments are unobjectionable and may be assigned or objectionable and should be vacated. There his work stops. Then the Tahsildar, as the administrative officer of the taluk, steps in, and he has to take action to regularise encroachments if they are not objectionable and to vacate them if objectionable. You will thus see that there is no overlapping of functions. The Tahsildar follows up and completes what the Assistant Tahsildar does. I do not see any harm in keeping up the connection. You also say that *pokkuvaravu* subdivision work is not done by the Assistant Tahsildar, but by the normal village staff. This is not correct. The Assistant Tahsildar does a good deal of *pokkuvaravu* subdivision work, not only with the temporary agency that he has at his disposal, but also through the regular village staff.

You next spoke of a regular resurvey and said that a supplemental survey was insufficient. Theoretically a resurvey is a very good thing, but you must also remember what the cost of such a survey would be. You want the Assistant Tahsildarship to be abolished. There was great difficulty in getting the sanction of the Legislative Council for the continuance of these officers. When Mr. V. P. Madhava

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Rao dealt with this matter, the settlement was in full swing, and the settlement and the survey then went on hand in hand. The present cost of a separate resurvey would be considerably higher. We are trying our level best to bring up our land records at as little cost as possible. We do not say that a supplemental survey is the only proper remedy. Statistics have been called for in respect of the Trivandrum and Chirayinkil taluks which are now ripe for resettlement to see whether a supplemental survey would be sufficient or whether a resurvey is necessary. In taluks surveyed under the *tak* system, my impression is that a resurvey is not really necessary and that a supplemental survey would be enough. The above two taluks were surveyed under the *tak* system. I do not think that the present system of land records maintenance is open to half the faults to which the old system was liable. We are trying to avoid those faults. I do not claim perfection for our methods. There may be some defects as regards details and these can only be remedied by experience and in course of time. The work of the Assistant Tahsildar is in its nature unpopular, as nobody likes to be told that he has made an encroachment and that he should pay a fine and vacate the encroachment. We have imposed restrictions in regard to the payment of fines. The rules lay down that, in cases where encroachments are not objectionable, no fine need be levied. The rules have been made as liberal as possible.

9. Oodukoor system of tenure and the enjoyment of lands thereunder.

Mr. A. P. P. Nadar (Member, Municipal Council, Kuzhittura) said that *oodukoor* was a peculiar arrangement prevalent in the taluks of Neyyattinkara, Vilavankod and Kalkulam, under which one and the same landed property was owned and enjoyed by different persons in different proportions without dividing their shares by metes and bounds. The produce was taken in common and divided among the several sharers in the proportions of their shares. The title of the several sharers was separate and independent of one another; but the possession could be said to be neither separate nor joint. This system could not rightly come under the category of either joint tenancy or tenancy-in-common, though it was in certain respects analogous to the latter. Hence it was a tenancy in itself and might be called the *oodukoor* tenancy. The system originated out of difficulties in the way of effecting partition. It seemed to be of recent origin, for it did not exist either at the time of the first land revenue settlement of the State in 926 M. E. or at the later settlements of 948 or 977. In 1012 it was recognised in the Sirkar accounts, but only in the case of a very few holdings. At the last settlement, however, *pattas* were indiscriminately granted not only for all *oodukoor* shares, but *oodukoor pattas* were granted also for lands which had been divided, improved and enjoyed separately. The grant of *oodukoor pattas* for those lands, while such *pattas* should have been granted only for the old trees standing on them, created considerable confusion and made the revenue records tell a different tale from what the actual title and enjoyment of hundreds of holdings ought to do actually. That and the great difficulty of enjoying properties in such small *oodukoor* shares were the causes of endless quarrels, civil suits and criminal cases. In the opinion of the Member the system was responsible for more than 50 per cent. of the criminal cases and about 75 per cent. of the civil suits in the taluks of Vilavankod and Neyyattinkara and also for the disproportionately high files and the tough nature of the suits of those taluks. He added that the system had crippled the productive power of those taluks and had caused great inconvenience and loss to the people. As *oodukoor* tenants very seldom co-operated with one another to improve their lands, and as, according to that system, if any one of them made any improvement, the benefit of it ordinarily went to all sharers alike, there was no incentive for any individual to improve *oodukoor* lands. Almost all *oodukoor* holdings were, therefore, found devoid of any permanent and valuable improvements. In conclusion, the Member made the following suggestions to prevent the multiplication and facilitate the gradual abolition of the system :—

(1) Either suits for partition of *oodukoor* properties should be made free of all costs, or they should be made cheap and compulsory, in which case the cost must be made a charge on the property.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly